

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-17 remain pending in the application, in which claims 1 and 8 are currently amended. Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the pending claims based on following discussions.

### **Response to Interview Summary**

As indicated by the interview summary of September 27, 2010, the amendment proposed by Applicant during the interview on September 15, 2010 overcomes the prior art of record. Accordingly, such amendment is made into independent claims 1 and 8 in the present response.

### **Rejections under 35 USC 103**

Claims 1-9 and 11-17 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 4,577,465 to Olsen et al. (hereinafter referred to as “Olsen”) in view of US Patent No. 6,135,709 to Stones (hereinafter referred to as “Stones”).

Independent claim 1 includes limitation *“the evacuation means is decoupled from the load lock chamber during the start up of the molecular pumping mechanism.”* Applicant respectfully submits that Olsen does not teach or suggest the claimed limitation. In FIG. 1 of Olsen, air ejector 38, oil pump 32, and high thermal capacitance cryopump 12 are connected to load lock chamber 16, and cannot be decoupled from the chamber, when any one of them is used to start up of the cryopump 20. *See, col. 5, lines 41-50.* Such difference between Olsen and the claimed invention is also acknowledged by the Examiner. *See, the Interview Summary.*

Stones is cited for its disclosure of a turbomolecular pumping mechanism, and not relied on for its teaching of a separate evacuation means shared by a load lock chamber

and a turbomolecular pump. Thus, it does not cure the above-mentioned deficiency of Olsen.

As such, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, as amended, is patentable over Olsen in view of Stones under 35 USC 103(a). Independent claim 8, as amended, includes limitations similar to that of claim 1. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 8 is also patentable over Olsen in view of Stones. Accordingly, claims 2-7, 9, and 11-17 that depend from claim 1 or 8 and include all the limitations recited therein are also patent over the cited prior art references under section 103.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Olsen in view of Stones, and further in view of US Patent No. 6,474,949 to Arai et al. (hereinafter referred to as “Arai”).

As discussed above, independent claim 8, as amended, is patentable over the cited prior art references under section 103. Accordingly, claim 10 that depends on claim 8 and includes all the limitations recited therein is also patentable over Olsen, Stones and Arai.

## CONCLUSION

Applicant has made an earnest attempt to place this application in an allowable form. In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the pending claims are drawn to a novel subject matter, patentably distinguishable over the prior art of record. Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections.

Applicant does not believe that any additional fee is due, but as a precaution, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional, necessary fee to deposit account number 50-4244.

Should Examiner deem that any further clarification is desirable, Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

By: Ting-Mao Chao, Reg. No. 60,126/

Ting-Mao Chao

Attorney for Applicant

Registration No. 60,126

Edwards Vacuum, Inc.  
Legal Service – Intellectual Property  
2041 Mission College Blvd. Suite 260  
Santa Clara, CA 95054

TEL: 1-408-496-1177 ext. 2222  
FAX: 1-408-496-1188

**Customer No.: 71134**